




JFW



Docket No.: 198443US2

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

RE: Application Serial No.: 09/737,742

Applicants: Tonnes BREKNE

Filing Date: December 18, 2000

For: ENCRYPTION OF PROGRAMS REPRESENTED AS  
POLYNOMIAL MAPPINGS AND THEIR  
COMPUTATIONS

Group Art Unit: 2132

Examiner: LANIER, B.

SIR:


Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Our check in the amount of \$0.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

**22850**

(703) 413-3000 (phone)  
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Michael R. Casey, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 40,294

DOCKET NO: 198443US2



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :  
TONNES BREKNE : EXAMINER: LANIER, B.  
SERIAL NO: 09/737,742 :  
FILED: DECEMBER 18, 2000 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2132  
FOR: ENCRYPTION OF PROGRAMS... :

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated January 6, 2005, applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group VI, claims 24, 25 and 34-39. That Restriction Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct inventions. However, MPEP § 803 states the following:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the examiner.


U.S. Application Serial No. 09/737,742

Restriction Response in response to Restriction Requirement mailed January 6, 2005

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of claims 1-67 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregory J. Maier", is written over a horizontal line.

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)

Michael R. Casey, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 40,294